

Third Member of Council.—

If you allege that the information before us is incorrect and furnish other information, necessary enquiries will be made.

Mr. S. Venkatesaiya.—

Have any copies been sold?

Third Member of Council.—

Some may have been.

Mr. S. Venkatesaiya.—

Is it not true that the present supply of books is enough to meet the demands of the next 2 centuries at least? And are the books not kept specially for the use of scholars who might occasionally apply for them and not intended actually for sale for profit?

Third Member of Council.—

Some purchase them also.

BY MESSRS. M. C. LINGE GOWDA, S. C. MALLIAH, H. C. DASAPPA, MAHOMED SATT, B.S. PUTTASWAMI, DHARMA-PRAKASA D. BANUMIAH, N. SIDDALINGA DEVARU, N. VEERARAJ URS, CHIKKALINGE GOWDA *alias* ANNE GOWDA, S. THIMMEGOWDA *alias* THAMMAIYA GOWDA, PATEL LINGE GOWDA, SANGANABASAPPA, K. N. PUTTANNA, PATEL SUBBANNA, GURUKAR NANJAPPA, CHIKKE GOWDA, KAPANIGOWDA, CHENNAPPA (Mysore District).—

Q.—22. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether the University Audit Board in their report for the year 1925-26 have pointed out any irregularities and defects in respect of the funds administered by the University;

(b) if so, what is the nature of the irregularities and the defects pointed out, and the amounts involved in them;

(c) whether the Government will be pleased to place the said audit report on the table of this House;

(d) whether it is a fact that the Government sanctioned a sum of Rs. 2,000 for the revision of the account branch of the University Office;

(e) if so, the date of the grant; whether the said sum was utilised; what are the reasons;

(f) if the answer to (a) is in the affirmative what steps have been taken by the Government to remedy the defects;

(g) whether it is a fact that some of the important account books and vouchers are reported to have been destroyed by white ants and if so what was the amount involved therein;

(h) if the answer to (g) is in the affirmative, what steps have been taken against the delinquent.

DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—

A.—22. (a) No. Certain observations were made in respect of stock accounts in particular.

(b) The defects noticed are mainly about—

(1) the condition of the stock accounts (relating to chemicals, apparatus, etc.) in the Institutions,

(2) the Library Registers not being posted up-to-date,

(3) want of regular detailed periodical local inspection of the accounts of the Institutions.

(c) No. The audit report is placed before the Senate for consideration.

(d) Yes.

(e) A formal provision was first made in the Budget for 1925-26. But this could not be utilised as the question of the revision of the system of accounts and internal audit of the University as also the question of staff required for accounts work, etc., were under correspondence between the University, the Comptroller and Government.

(f) Government have sanctioned arrangements for the detailed audit of the accounts of the University by the auditor of the Comptroller's Office.

An Assistant Comptroller has also been appointed to examine the accounts and submit proposals for the improvement or revision of the system of accounts and internal audit of the University and also in respect of the staff for accounts work.

(g) No account book has been destroyed but a few old vouchers of the previous years the accounts for which had been audited and whose period of preservation was over were damaged by white ants. These vouchers were due to have been destroyed and their loss is not material.

(h) *Vide* reply to (g) above.

Supplementary Questions and Answers.

Mr. S. C. Malliah.—

With reference to answer to Question (g), may I know how long the records have to be preserved?

Third Member of Council.—

There are special rules in regard to preservation of records. Different periods are fixed with reference to different kinds of records.

Mr. S. C. Malliah.—

Were the vouchers damaged after the preservation period was over?

Third Member of Council.—

Yes.

Mr. B. S. Puttaswami.—

With reference to Question (c), why should not the audit report be placed on the table of this House?

Third Member of Council.—

The report had been placed before the Senate whose proceedings have been published. This body is not meant to do the work of the Senate over again.

Mr. B. S. Puttaswami.—

We want to know whether the grant made to the University for various purposes has been utilised properly. Is it not the duty of the Government, therefore, to furnish us with the report?

Third Member of Council.—

We cannot re-publish or place before this House all those details.

Mr. B. S. Puttaswami.—

Has it not been pointed out in the audit report that the stock is not properly maintained?

Third Member of Council.—

If so, the Senate will discuss the matter and make proper arrangements.

Mr. B. S. Puttaswami.—

Is it not the duty of this House to see that that has been done?

Third Member of Council.—

That is too large an order. We cannot go into the details of all the proceedings taken before other bodies.

Mr. B. S. Puttaswami.—

Where is the harm in placing the report before this House?

Third Member of Council.—

It is not possible to do so; but if any of you want to see it, we can send you a copy.

Mr. B. S. Puttaswami.—

Has not the report been placed on the Press Table?

Third Member of Council.—

That is a matter concerning the Senate.

Mr. M. C. Linge Gowda.—

Has it come to the notice of the Government that there is no member representing this Assembly on the Senate?

Third Member of Council.—

Yes.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

What are the defects pointed out in the audit report?

Third Member of Council.—

We cannot give those details without referring to the report.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

What action has been taken to bring the register up-to-date?

Third Member of Council.—

Necessary action is being taken.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

With reference to the observation contained in the audit report that inspection is inadequate, may I know who is responsible for such a state of affairs?

Third Member of Council.—

These defects have been pointed out for the first time. Government are aware that arrangements for audit in the past were not as satisfactory as they might have been.

Mr. N. G. Sanjeeviah.—

Was it not necessary to preserve all the vouchers carefully?

Third Member of Council.—

No; the accounts have been passed, no purpose would be served by the vouchers any longer.

BY MESSRS. M. C. LINGEGOWDA, S. C. MALLIAH, H. C. DASAPPA, B. S. PUTTASWAMY, DHARMAPRAKASA D. BANUMAIH, N. SIDDALINGA DEVARU, N. VEERARAJA URS, CHIKKALINGEGOWDA *alias* ANNE GOWDA, THIMMEGOWDA *alias* THAMMIAH GOWDA, PATEL LINGEGOWDA, SANGANABASAPPA, K. N. PUTTANNAH, PATEL SUBBANNA, GURUKAR NANJAPPA, CHIKKE GOWDA, KAPINI GOWDA, CHENNAPPA (Mysore District).—

Q—23. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) how many bills were placed before the Representative Assembly for opinion after reforms were introduced (the number placed in each of the sessions to be furnished);

(b) how many bills were rejected by the Assembly since the date of the reforms (details by sessions to be furnished);

(c) how many of the bills so rejected were placed before the Legislative Council; what are the details of bills before the various meetings held;

(d) how many bills were placed before the various sessions of the Legislative Council, after the reforms were introduced without being placed before the Representative Assembly;

(e) what is the number of resolutions that were recommended to Government in each of the sessions of